

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-21, 34, 44, and 46-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 15, 34, 44, and 46 have been amended as shown on pages 2-5 of the Reply. New claims 48, 49 and 50 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification as filed at Fig.5, page 13 lines 12-14 and page 16 lines 24 – page 17 line 4.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, 34, 44, 46 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, 34, 44, 46 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, *et al.* (U.S. 5,555,346) and Kelts (U.S. 2001/0030667). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reason. Neither Gross, *et al.* nor Kelts, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed aspects.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to providing an interactive user interface associated with one or more prioritized items which come from various external sources. The priorities are automatically determined by a prioritization system or may be provided by a user. To this end independent claims 1, 34, 44 and 46 recite similar features namely: ***a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the***

wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority. Neither of the cited documents teaches nor suggests such claimed aspects.

Gross, *et al.* relates to an event driven and conditional rule based mail messaging system wherein a rule mechanism having a “When-If-Then” condition is implemented. Hence, a repertoire of events considered to be significant events is defined upon which actions in the electronic mail messaging system are triggered (*See* Gross Abstract). However, Gross, *et al.* does not teach or suggest displaying email messages in accordance with their priorities let alone teach or suggest a user interface comprising the claimed patterns to display domains/sources of the email with object representing the email messages as recited in the subject claims.

The secondary document Kelts fails to make up for this deficiency. Kelts relates to retrieving programming information and for generating an interactive navigation interface for displaying such programming information. Accordingly, Kelts teaches displaying categories and subcategories in accordance with a suitable prioritization metric which can be based on frequency of selected of items by a user. Although Kelts refers to a set-top device for a television that works like a general purpose computer comprising additional software application such as email applications, it does not teach or suggest using prioritization schema to prioritize emails let alone teach a user interface that arranges emails in accordance with their priorities in a map comprising a plurality of colored wedges as recited in the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this rejection should be with respect to independent claims 1, 34, 44, 46 and all claims that depend there from.

II. Rejection of Claims 14, 17 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 14, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, *et al.*, Kelts and Nielsen (U.S. 6,337,699). Applicants’ representative respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 14, 17 and 18 depend from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross, *et al.* and Kelts does not teach or suggest all of the aspects of claim 1. Nielsen relates to displaying an icon in a manner to convey information to a user via frequency of blinking, degree of blinking, color and degree of fill of

interior space of an icon to represent information regarding independent variables. But it does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross, *et al.* and Kelts with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, claims 14, 17 and 18 are not obvious over the combination of Gross, *et al.*, Kelts and Nielsen and accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, *et al.*, Kelts, Nielsen, and Knowlton (U.S. 6,057,842). Applicants' representative respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 15 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Knowlton relates to a visual link mechanism for identifying addresses of locations in a plurality of remote systems and does not remedy aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, and Nielsen. Thus, claim 15 is not obvious over the combination of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Nielsen and Knowlton and accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn

IV. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, *et al.*, Kelts, Nielsen, and Simonoff *et al.*, (U.S. 6,078,322). Applicants' representative respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 19 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Simonoff *et al.*, relates to a virtual machine or device that facilitates interoperability between two or more computers but does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, and Nielsen. Thus, claim 15 is not obvious over the combination of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Nielsen and Simonoff, *et al.* and accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP248US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731